

Gerber Area Recreation Improvements Worksheet
Klamath Falls Resource Area Project File Number -00-02
Interim

Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management

Note: This Worksheet is to be completed consistent with the policies stated in the Instruction Memorandum entitled, "Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Adequacy" transmitting this Worksheet and the "Guidelines for using the DNA Worksheet," located at the end of the Worksheet.

A. Describe the Proposed Action

Gerber Recreation site existing access roads, camp loops, campsites, trails and related facilities are in need of corrective maintenance, improvement or replacement to continue to provide an enhanced recreational experience and satisfy visitor needs. Existing facility maintenance, improvement or replacement work to be done within the confines of the existing Gerber Recreation site (previously disturbed ground) include: rocking and chip sealing/paving road system and campsites, replacement fish cleaning stations, picnic tables, barrier posts, camp host RV holding tank, water lines, hydrants, water well and pump house. The Barnes Valley Boat ramp access road would receive corrective maintenance/reconstruction to prevent runoff from entering Gerber Reservoir.

New or additional facilities proposed at Gerber Recreation Site include: underground water and electrical lines, cattle intrusion fencing with cattleguards, boat ramp, dock and parking, BOR house RV holding tank, group day-use shelters, and hiking trails. In addition, a small parking area and new toilet are proposed for the Barnes Valley boat ramp area. The Willow Valley Reservoir area would receive access road and parking area reconstruction and an improved primitive boat ramp.

These projects would be funded with Recreation Pipeline Restoration funding, and would be implemented over the next five years (as funding becomes available). No fee increases or additional fees are planned or anticipated because of these projects (except for groups using the proposed group day use shelter). **See previously completed Optional Plan Conformance Review/NEPA Compliance Record with attached table for descriptions of proposed actions and attached maps for locations of proposed projects.**

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name* Klamath Falls R.A. R.O.D. and RMP Date Approved 6/2/95 Other document _____
_____ Date Approved _____

* List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans and activity, project, management, or

program plans, or applicable amendments thereto)

X The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Klamath Falls Resource Area Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan, Recreation Program, pages 47-52; Map 7: Recreation Sites/Areas and Map 9 Trails and Byways.

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

See the attached Klamath Falls Resource Area Optional Plan Conformance Review/NEPA Compliance Record and/or Categorical Exclusion Review, Klamath Falls Resource Area Project File Number -99-31, Gerber Area Recreation Improvements. This document contains interdisciplinary team (IDT) meeting notes/discussions regarding the proposal, proposed mitigation/project design features and staff specialist review sign-off sheet.

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

Gayle Sitter initiated Section 7 consultation with US Fish and Wildlife Service, as required for the bald eagle and sucker. With current nest season and distance restrictions in place we have determined a “no effect” on the bald eagle. It has also been determined that all activities, except the new proposed boat ramp at the South Gerber campground, are a “no effect on the suckers. The boat ramp will be addressed in a later Biological Assessment. (See attached Mitigation Measures/Project Design Features).

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The RMP/ROD (page 49 and 50) specifically addresses the management of existing recreation

sites, and maintaining the option for recreation development in potential sites and trails. For the existing Gerber Recreation site, and East Gerber Boat Ramp (Barnes Valley) the BLM is to accommodate overnight, day use and mobility impaired visitors and boat ramps, through continued operation and maintenance. Potential recreation sites and trails, such as Willow Valley Reservoir, (RMP Map 7), and the Miller Creek Trail extension (RMP Map 9), are to be developed as funding and/or partnerships becomes available and if development is consistent with other land use objectives and allocations.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The FINAL Klamath Falls RMP and Environmental Impact Statement, completed in September 1994, evaluated and analyzed five different alternatives, (in addition to the no action and preferred alternative), covering a wide range of levels of development for existing and potential recreation sites and trails. The types and level of development proposed in this action are within the scope and range as described in the preferred alternative. The following current issues and concerns were addressed within the range of alternatives: meeting public demand for recreation opportunities within the planning area, supporting tourism efforts, improving handicap accessibility, increased access to multi-purpose trails, additional developments such as overnight camping, day-use facilities and interpretive sites, and other efforts designed to enhance and meet visitor recreation experience expectations and satisfy public land users.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The existing analysis is valid, the proposal has been reviewed by staff specialists and interdisciplinary team members for any new information and circumstances. Section 7 Threatened and Endangered Species consultation was coordinated by Gayle Sitter and standards/mitigation have been included in the project design features (see attached Gerber Area Recreation Improvements Optional Plan Conformance Review.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The Klamath Falls Resource Area RMP/EIS was reviewed and completed by staff specialists working together in an interdisciplinary team setting. Interdisciplinary team analysis was conducted using standards and guidelines as provided by BLM Oregon and Washington Office instructions.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The Direct and Indirect impacts of the proposed action are essentially the same as those considered by staff specialists who evaluated the Recreation program section and various alternatives in the Final RMP/EIS. The RMP/EIS evaluated site specific impacts of managing and maintaining existing recreation sites and the option of recreation developments of potential sites.

6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The cumulative impacts that would result from the proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the RMP/EIS.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The Klamath Falls Resource Area RMP/EIS planning effort incorporated substantial opportunities for public input and interagency review during the various stages of plan development. Local meetings (including a meeting held at Bonanza) were held to answer questions, consider and incorporate public comments, including those for the recreation resource section proposals.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis and preparation of this worksheet. *(You could substitute an appropriate existing NEPA sign-off cover sheet for this section.)* **(See attached Gerber Area Recreation Improvement Plan Conformance Review/NEPA Compliance Record for interdisciplinary team review, signatures and mitigation measures/project design features).**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Conclusion

- ☐ Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA

Note: If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.

____/s./ Teresa A. Raml_____
Signature of the Responsible Official

____10/28/99_____
Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and **does not constitute an appealable decision.**

Guidelines for Using the DNA Worksheet and Evaluating the NEPA Adequacy Criteria

These guidelines supplement the policies contained in the Instruction Memorandum entitled “Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Adequacy”. During preparation of this worksheet, if you determine that one or more of the criteria are not met, you do not need to complete the Worksheet. If one or more of these criteria is not met, you may reject the proposal, or complete appropriate NEPA compliance (EA, EIS, Supplemental EIS, or CX if applicable) and plan amendments before proceeding with the proposed action. Documenting why the criterion (criteria) has (have) not been met may be beneficial in preparing new or supplemental NEPA documents, however.

Criterion 1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action at a site specifically analyzed in an existing NEPA document? In the limited situations in which an existing NEPA document(s) can properly be relied upon without supplementation, explain whether and how the existing documents analyzed the proposed action (include page numbers). If there are differences between the actions included in existing documents and the proposed action, explain why they are not considered to be substantial.

Criterion 2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests and resource values? Explain whether the alternatives to the current proposed action that were analyzed in the existing NEPA documents and associated record constitute a reasonable range of alternatives with respect to the current proposed action, and if so, how. Identify how current issues and concerns were addressed within the range of alternatives in existing NEPA documents. If new alternatives are being proposed by the public to address current issues and concerns, and you conclude they do not need to be analyzed, explain why.

Criterion 3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances? New information or circumstances could include the following. If any of the listed items below are applicable, you need to determine whether it (they) constitute(s) new information or circumstances.

- a. New standards or goals for managing resources. Standards and goals include, but are not limited to: BLM’s land health standards and guidelines, recovery plans for listed species prepared by the Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service, requirements contained in a biological opinion or conference report related to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and the requirement to address disproportionate impacts on minority populations and low income communities (E.O. 12898).
- b. Changes in resource conditions within the affected area the existing NEPA analyses were conducted, e.g., changes in habitat condition and trend; listed, proposed, candidate, and Bureau designated sensitive species; water quality, including any identified impaired water bodies under Section 303 of the Clean Water Act; air quality; vegetation condition and trend; soil stability; visual quality; cultural resource condition; and wildlife population trend(s); etc.

c. Changes of resource-related plans, policies, or programs of State and local governments, Indian tribes, or other federal agencies.

d. Designations established in the affected area since the existing NEPA analysis and documentation was prepared. Designations include, but are not limited to wilderness, wilderness study areas, National Natural Landmarks, National Conservation Areas, National Monuments, National Register properties, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, and Research Natural Areas.

Criterion 4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document continue to be appropriate for the proposed action? Explain how the methodologies and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document are current and sufficient for supporting approval of the proposed action. If valid new technologies and methodologies (e.g. air quality modeling) exist, explain why it continues to be reasonable to rely on the method previously used.

Criterion 5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action? Review the impact analysis in the existing NEPA document(s). Explain how the direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action are analyzed in the existing NEPA documents, and would, or would not, differ from those identified in the existing NEPA document. Consider the effect new information or circumstances may have on the environmental impacts predicted in the existing NEPA document.

Criterion 6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Would the current proposed action, if implemented, change the cumulative impact analysis? Consider the impacts analysis in existing NEPA documents, the effects of relevant activities that have been implemented since existing NEPA documents were completed and the effects of the current proposed action.

Criterion 7. Is the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action? Explain how the nature of public involvement in previous NEPA documents continues to be adequate and valid in light of current issues, concerns, views, and controversies.